DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 294 323 EA 020 023

AUTHOR Barnes, Susan
TITLE The Development of the Texas Teacher Appraisal System.
INSTITUTION Texas Education Agency, Austin.
PUB DATE Apr 87
NOTE 37p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Research and Education Association (Washington, DC, April 20-24, 1987).
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Advisory Committees; Boards of Education; Elementary Secondary Education; Evaluation Criteria; Evaluators; Meetings; *Program Effectiveness; *Program Evaluation; Public Schools; Research and Development; School Surveys; *Teacher Evaluation
IDENTIFIERS Texas Education Agency; Texas Teacher Appraisal Instrument; *Texas Teacher Appraisal System

ABSTRACT

The Texas Education Agency instigated the teacher appraisal system to determine decisions concerning the career ladder, contract renewals, and staff development. In fall 1984, the agency staff researched teacher evaluation through a literature review and through interviews with administrators from 156 school districts. This research dictated the indicators and criteria for the system. An advisory committee scrutinized the work. A survey in spring 1985 validated the content of the system. In September 1985, the State Board of Education examined the draft materials, advised on revisions, and authorized an examination of the draft proposal. A pilot study was authorized in October, involving six school districts from 1985 to 1986. In March, the state board improved the pilot system, reported the results of a bias review and a teacher questionnaire, and rejected the replacement of the state appraisal instrument with local instruments. Forty educators were trained to train local appraisers in April 1986. In fall 1986, the agency staff conducted a study to determine the adequacy of the teacher appraisal instrument. In February 1987, the state board authorized a revision review panel to examine field research and recommend changes in the system. Anticipated April revisions in the system necessitate more data analysis. A selected bibliography, 10 tables, and 5 attachments are included. (RG)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Linda Kemp

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED294323

The Development of
The Texas Teacher Appraisal System

Susan Barnes
Director of Teacher Education
Texas Education Agency

A paper presented at the
American Educational Research Association
1987

EA020023

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Development of
The Texas Teacher Appraisal System

With the passage of reform legislation in 1984, the Texas Education Agency began development of a teacher appraisal system to be used for career ladder decisions, staff development, and contract renewal. This paper briefly summarizes the development process, the results of the pilot study, the first year of implementation, and the plans for future research and development.

Development Process

During the fall of 1984, agency staff conducted a review of literature for research on teaching and on teacher evaluation and surveyed other states where statewide appraisal systems were in place or in the planning stages. In addition, 156 randomly selected school districts in Texas were contacted, and administrators interviewed regarding the evaluation systems in use prior to the reform legislation. Most districts sent copies of those evaluation forms to the agency for content analysis. From these sources, a draft of domains, criteria, and indicators to be considered for inclusion in the evaluation system was constructed.

To review the work of the agency staff, the Teacher Appraisal Advisory Committee, consisting of 17 members, was established. Six members were classroom teachers; one member represented the educational service centers, one higher education, and the rest administrators. That committee met three times over a period of six

months to advise the staff on content of the evaluation, measurement issues, and procedures.

A job-relatedness survey, which served as the basis of the content validation for the teacher appraisal system, was conducted during the spring of 1985. A sample of 30,000 teachers stratified by gender, race/ethnicity, teaching field, teaching assignment, and years of experience was drawn, and surveys were distributed to those individuals through the local district offices. Approximately 17,000 responses were received. Teachers were asked to respond to items in terms of their observability, importance, and frequency of use. To be retained in the pool of potential items, over 80% of the teachers had to judge the item observable, and the ratings of frequency and importance had to be over 3.75 on a five-point scale. These items which were affirmed by the sample form the basis of the teacher appraisal process (Barnes & Dodds, 1986). Surveys were also sent to 400 school administrators and to 100 teacher educators whose responses were very similar to those of teachers.

In September 1985, the Committee for Personnel of the State Board of Education reviewed the draft materials, directed revisions, and authorized expert review of the draft proposal. The experts consulted were Dr. Richard Manatt of the Iowa State University, Dr. John Goodlad of the University of Washington, Brig. Gen. Billy Bowles of the United States Air Force, and Dr. Lester Solomon of the Georgia State Department of Education. At the October meeting of the Committee for Personnel, revisions were made and a pilot study authorized.

Six school districts participated in the pilot study conducted during school year 1985-86: Slaton, Santa Rosa, Seguin, Grandfalls-Royalty, Port Arthur, and New Boston. Ninety-six local appraisers in each district were trained to use the pilot instruments and procedures for the appraisal of the 1600 teachers in the six districts. Agency staff visited each site at least twice to orient teachers, observe in classrooms, and to interview participants. Ongoing progress reports were made each month to the Committee for Personnel. In January, testimony was given to that committee by each superintendent and some local appraisers from each of the school districts involved in the pilot study. In February, one teacher from each district gave testimony to the committee, and two days of public hearings were held by the State Board of Education on the subject of the proposed appraisal system.

The results of the data analyses generated during the pilot study were reported by Performance Assessment Systems, Inc., of Athens, Georgia, under contract to the Texas Education Agency; agency staff prepared an executive summary which was presented to the State Board of Education (Texas Education Agency, 1986). Data were analyzed using the GENOVA system (Crick & Brennan, 1983). The results of the pilot study as briefly stated in the executive summary were:

1. Although the overall scores were very high, no substantial differences emerged between subgroups based upon ethnicity, gender, teaching assignment, teaching field, or years of experience.

2. The factor analysis confirmed the organizational structure of the

pilot instrument and its construct validity. The identification of a strong single dimension suggests that there is a strong, unifying dimension measuring the quality of teaching performance.

3. Regarding interobserver agreement in awarding or withholding credit, the classroom agreement rate during training was 87.5, a rate which is quite acceptable, and the videotape agreement rate during training was 81.5.

4. Based upon the results of the pilot generalizability studies, each domain is the TTAS appears to be suitable for differentiating teachers against a high performance standard when using multiple observers (Brennan, 1978; Capie, W., Ellett, C. D., & Johnson, C. E., 1982).

5. The results of the differential validity study were supportive of the ability of the TTAS to differentiate teachers considered "master teachers" by their peers from all other teachers in the sample.

6. The addition of an exceptional quality decision was investigated during the pilot. Appraisers were able to assess teaching behaviors as meeting standard expectations or as being exceptional examples of teaching.

At the March meeting of the State Board of Education, several important revisions were made in the pilot system prior to approval for implementation for school year 1986-87. Those changes included:

1. allowing the first semester of implementation to be a practice run without impact upon the teacher's career ladder assignment;

2. removal of the work sample assessment, an attempt to measure

the teacher's ability to plan and evaluate;

3. opening the process to informal, as well as the original formal, observations;

4. adding a domain to measure job responsbilities such as grading and reporting student progress;

5. assigning 60% of the weight of the evaluation to the teacher's supervisor and 40% to the other appraiser;

6. the addition of an exceptional quality scale to measure the upper ranges of skill in teaching behaviors; and,

7. changing the focus of the teacher self-appraisal from a self rating to goal setting for student productivity.

At that meeting the results of a bias review and a teacher questionnaire were also reported. For the bias review, 100 minority educators were randomly selected to receive surveys. They were asked to designate any indicator which was biased against any racial group. No indicators were judged as biased by more than 24% of the 29 respondents. The concerns specified focused upon Criterion 8. Uses Acceptable Communication Skills. Because the comments appeared to address implementation issues for this criterion, training for these indicators focused heavily upon fair application.

The teacher questionnaire, distributed to all teachers in the pilot study, was answered by over 900 teachers. Their responses, focused upon the pilot appraisal system and the revisions under consideration by the state board, generally approved of the direction taken by the State Board

of Education.

Finally, the State Board of Education voted not to exercise an option for substitution of local instruments for the state appraisal instrument, and directed that the first year of implementation be undertaken. In relation to school year 1986-87, attachments 1-5 provide an overview of the system; the content of the instrument as organized by domains, criteia, and indicators; copies of the observation record and the end-of-year appraisal record; and, a copy of the teacher self-appraisal form.

In April 1986, 40 educators underwent pilot training in preparation for the training . local appraisers during the summer of 1986. A turn key model of training was used: From the initial group of 40, four teams of four were selected to train the next level of 240 trainers who would work through the 20 educational service centers delivering training directly to approximately 14,000 local appraisers.

Implementation began in September 1986 with teacher orientation using materials and a suggested outline prepared by agency staff. A common set of videotapes were distributed to each school district with copies of the teacher orientation manual for all teachers. In most districts, superintendents, who had been required to become trained appraisers by state board rule, provided an introduction to the orientation session.

Fall Research and Development

In the fall of 1986, agency staff conducted an instrument reliability study to test whether the instrument was suitable for differentiating among teachers while generalizing over observers, teaching behaviors, and occasions. For the reliability study, five school districts were contacted and asked to supply teams of appraisers. A total of 28 randomly selected teachers (16 elementary and 12 secondary) within those districts agreed to participate in the study. A team of three appraisers observed each teacher on three occasions with observations varied over time of day and subject matter for each teacher. Observers scored observation records independently. A generalizability analysis was conducted by Performance Assessment Systems, Inc., under contract to the Teacher Education Agency. The generalizability coefficients for each domain and for the total instrument score are presented in Table 1.

In addition to the reliability study, the agency gathered field data for standard setting. Due to the changes made in the pilot system made prior to implementation, standard setting was postponed from spring 1985 until a sample of data could be drawn which reflected current rules and procedures. In October, a random sample of 3,000 teachers was drawn, and districts were asked to send coded photocopies of appraisal records for these teachers as the records were completed. By January, 923 cases were complete and served as the basis for standard setting. Forty-five educators, including 23 teachers, met in Austin and independently determined the number of indicators for each domain which should be achieved for each performance rating, from unsatisfactory to clearly

outstanding. The composite of their recommendations was presented to the State Board of Education and, after modification of Domain V, accepted at the January board meeting (Attachment 6). Domain V is the domain for job responsibilities, and the teacher receives credit automatically for those indicators unless denial is supported by documentation.

In February 1987, the State Board authorized a revision review panel of 28 persons to examine the written input received from the field, consider their own experiences and knowledge, and make recommendations to the board for changes to the system. For that panel the fall data collection was extended, resulting in a final data set of 1245 cases. Tables 2, 3, and 4 (attached) show that there was very little difference in the performances of teachers at various assignment levels, in subject areas, or by gender or ethnic group. Table 2 presents results by number of indicators earned per domain; Table 3 presents results converted from raw indicators to the five point performance rating scale contained in statute; and Table 4 presents results with weights for teacher supervisor (60%) and other appraiser (40%) assigned.

The revision panel also had access to a series of factor analyses, an analysis of decision dependability, and a generalizability analysis, all performed by Performance Assessment Systems, Inc. One factor analysis examined the relationship of each criterion to the total score (Table 5), another examined the relationship between each indicator and the domain (Table 6), and the third the relationship between each indicator and the underlying structure of the instrument (Table 7). As can be seen from

Table 5, two criteria (#4. Maximizes amount of time available for instruction and #8. Uses acceptable communication skills) show low relationships to the total instrument. Tables 6 and 7 provide further evidence that the indicators in criterion 8 are not strongly related to either the domain or the underlying factor of effective teaching.

Tables 8 and 9 display the results of a decision dependability analysis (phi lambda) with two or four observations. These results give an indication of the confidence which can be placed in the scores given using the Texas Teacher Appraisal Intrument. In both tables it can be seen that determining whether a teacher is unsatisfactory or below expectations, whether a teacher is below expectations or satisfactory, or whether a teacher is exceeding expectations or clearly outstanding is more reliable than determining whether a teacher if satisfactory or exceeding expectations. It can also be seen that decision dependability increases with four observations at all levels.

Table 10 provides an estimate of reliability (rho squared) of assigning scores based upon one, two, three, or four observations for each domain and for a total instrument score both with and without Domain V. As would be expected, reliability increases as the number of observations increases and that the reliability of the total score is greater than the reliability of individual domains, in all cases except Domain III.

At the April meeting of the State Board of Education, revisions to the TTAS are expected based upon the recommendations of the revision review

panel and agency staff. One to two days of additional training are planned for the summer; current rule already requires periodic training and recertification of appraisers.

Ongoing Research and Development

With the anticipted changes to the TTAS prior to school year 1987-88, additional data analyses will be needed. The state legislature is currently in session and several bills to reduce the statutory requirement, four observations for each teacher each year, have been introduced. This change would, of course, place additional demands upon the system, thus the decision analyses with varying numbers of observations and the analyses comparing domain scores and a total instrument score were included during the first year of implementation. In addition, other major changes, such as a reduction in the number of indicators, are being discussed by the State Board of Education. These changes will require a new standard setting exercise using data gathered under then current rules and procedures. This standard setting is again planned for January to allow a full semester of implementation. A complete set of data analyses similar to those briefly described here will also be completed to investigate how the changes have impacted the system.

Selected Bibliography

Barnes, S. & Dodds, J. (1986). Results of the Job-Relatedness Survey for Teacher Appraisal. A paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.

Brennan, R.L. (1978). Extensions of Generalizability Theory to Domain References Testing, American College Testing Program, Iowa City.

Capie, W., Ellett, C. D., & Johnson, C. E. (1982). The effects of assessment demand characteristics on the dependability of teacher performance measures. A paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York.

Crick, J. E., & Brennan, R. L. (1983). GENOVA: A general purpose analyses of variance system. Iowa City, IA: American College Testing Program.

Texas Education Agency. (1986) Executive Summary of the Final Report on the Development of the Texas Teacher Appraisal System. Austin, Texas.

Table 1.

Generalizability Coefficients For

the Texas Teacher Appraisal Instrument

Reliability Study

Domain I	Domain II	Domain III	Domain IV	Total Instrument
.88	.85	.85	.87	.90

Table 2

Mean Domain Scores for Subgroups

Group	Domain I	Domain II	Domain III	Domain IV	Domain V
Total	14.00	17.73	18.36	10.42	16.24
0 Years (77)	13.16	17.32	17.59	10.26	16.20
1-2 Years (115)	13.92	17.50	18.23	10.36	16.28
3-5 Years (173)	13.71	17.60	18.03	10.18	16.20
6-10 Years (327)	14.11	17.85	18.50	10.41	16.24
11-20 Years (402)	14.30	17.88	18.60	10.63	16.23
21 + Years (151)	13.79	17.57	18.26	10.26	16.31
Elem (546)	14.23	17.95	18.44	10.66	16.26
Sec (521)	13.72	17.47	18.37	10.11	16.22
Spec (108)	14.30	17.90	17.91	10.78	16.29
Voc (62)	13.53	17.57	18.00	9.91	16.23
Generic (484)	14.30	17.97	18.51	10.73	16.26
Science (68)	13.34	17.21	18.05	9.68	16.36
Math (107)	13.60	17.48	18.45	10.06	16.18
Lang Arts (138)	14.26	17.68	18.59	10.50	16.32
Soc Sci (69)	13.59	17.29	18.13	9.82	16.26
Lang (23)	13.83	17.15	18.46	9.89	16.13
HPE (101)	13.50	17.76	18.13	10.27	16.06
Fine Arts (50)	13.73	17.46	18.26	10.23	16.22
Business (22)	13.34	17.32	18.27	9.73	16.16
Voc (70)	13.78	17.68	18.25	10.13	16.24
Other (112)	14.26	17.89	17.96	10.74	16.28
Black (92)	14.14	17.87	18.27	10.46	16.32
Hispanic (164)	14.06	17.74	18.37	10.32	16.29
White (987)	13.97	17.71	18.37	10.43	16.23
Female (969)	14.17	17.84	18.45	10.58	16.27
Male (276)	13.14	17.32	18.01	9.82	16.13
Ladder (290)	14.13	17.90	18.45	10.40	16.20
I (455)	13.63	17.49	17.99	10.26	16.21
II (500)	14.26	17.85	18.63	10.56	16.29

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 3

Mean "Status" Scores for Subgroups

Group	Domain I	Domain II	Domain III	Domain IV	Domain V	Total
Total	3.75	3.99	3.66	3.74	4.12	3.85
0 Years (77)	3.52	3.88	3.47	3.71	4.10	3.75
1-2 Years (115)	3.76	3.93	3.61	3.71	4.14	3.82
3-5 Years (173)	3.66	3.97	3.55	3.64	4.09	3.79
6-10 Years (327)	3.77	4.02	3.69	3.75	4.12	3.87
11-20 Years (402)	3.84	4.04	3.73	3.82	4.12	3.91
21 + Years (151)	3.67	3.94	3.66	3.66	4.14	3.82
Elem (546)	3.80	4.03	3.69	3.82	4.13	3.90
Sec (521)	3.70	3.93	3.66	3.64	4.10	3.81
Spec (108)	3.79	4.05	3.51	3.91	4.14	3.88
Voc (62)	3.62	3.99	3.53	3.56	4.12	3.76
Generic (484)	3.81	4.05	3.70	3.85	4.13	3.91
Science (68)	3.61	3.83	3.60	3.50	4.17	3.74
Math (107)	3.71	3.96	3.70	3.64	4.10	3.82
Lang Arts (138)	3.80	3.98	3.70	3.78	4.14	3.88
Soc Stud (69)	3.68	3.88	3.62	3.53	4.10	3.76
Lang (23)	3.70	3.85	3.67	3.54	4.07	3.75
HPE (101)	3.62	4.01	3.60	3.66	4.04	3.79
Fine Arts (50)	3.74	3.85	3.62	3.69	4.11	3.81
Business (22)	3.66	3.89	3.61	3.48	4.09	3.73
Non Voc (70)	3.67	4.00	3.61	3.62	4.11	3.80
Other (112)	3.79	4.04	3.53	3.89	4.14	3.88
Black (92)	3.78	4.04	3.60	3.74	4.15	3.86
Hispanic (164)	3.72	3.98	3.62	3.68	4.15	3.83
White (387)	3.75	3.99	3.67	3.75	4.11	3.85
Female (969)	3.79	4.01	3.68	3.80	4.13	3.88
Male (276)	3.62	3.91	3.58	3.54	4.07	3.74
Ladder (290)	3.78	4.02	3.68	3.73	4.10	3.86
Ladder I (455)	3.67	3.93	3.56	3.69	4.11	3.79
Ladder II (500)	3.81	4.03	3.73	3.79	4.14	3.90
Supervisor	3.73	4.00	3.65	3.73	4.16	
Other Observer	3.77	3.98	3.66	3.75	4.08	
Scheduled (1650)	3.77	3.99	3.67	3.75	4.10	
Not (793)	3.71	3.98	3.65	3.73	4.15	

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 4
Distribution of Results for Subgroups

	Final Score Range				
	1.5-2.49	2.5-3.49	3.5-4.49	4.5-5.49	Career Ladder Pool
Total (N-1245)	3.0	242.0	898.0	102.0	
Percentage	.3	19.5	72.1	8.2	80.3
Percentage for					
0 Years (n-77)	-	33.3	58.8	7.8	66.6
1-2 Years (n-115)	-	20.9	70.4	8.7	79.1
3-5 Years (n-175)	.6	21.7	72.8	4.9	77.7
6-10 Years (n-327)	-	17.0	74.3	8.7	83.0
11-20 Years (n-402)	.3	15.8	75.0	9.0	84.0
21 + Years (n-151)	.7	23.7	67.0	8.6	75.6
Elem (n-546)	.2	16.6	73.8	9.4	83.2
Sec (n-521)	.2	22.2	71.0	6.6	77.6
Spec (n-108)	.9	16.7	74.0	8.4	82.4
Voc (n-62)	-	26.6	67.0	6.5	73.5
Generic (n-484)	.2	16.3	73.7	9.8	83.5
Science (n-68)	1.5	23.5	66.2	8.8	75.0
Math (n-107)	-	19.6	73.8	6.5	80.3
Lang Arts (n-138)	-	19.2	70.0	10.9	80.0
Soc Science (n-69)	-	27.8	67.9	4.4	72.3
For Lang (n-23)	-	39.1	60.9	-	60.9
HPE (n-101)	-	20.8	75.2	4.0	79.2
Fine Arts (n-50)	-	20.0	74.0	6.0	80.0
Business (n-22)	-	27.3	72.7	-	72.9
Non Voc (n-70)	-	22.0	67.9	10.0	77.9
Other (n-112)	.9	17.0	74.2	8.0	82.2
Black (n-92)	-	23.0	66.7	10.4	77.1
Hispanic (n-164)	.6	22.6	65.8	11.0	76.8
White (n-987)	.2	18.6	73.6	7.5	81.1
Females (n-969)	.2	17.8	72.8	9.2	82.0
Males (n-276)	.6	25.2	69.9	4.4	74.3
Ladder I (n-455)	.4	24.3	69.1	6.3	75.4
Ladder II (n-500)	-	15.2	75.4	9.4	84.8

Table 5

Factor Pattern Matrix for Analysis of TTAS Criteria

Criterion	Regression Coefficients
1	.86
2	.87
3	.81
4	.35
5	.59
6	.83
7	.74
8	.11
9	.77
10	.74

Table 6

Correlation of Teacher Mean Indicator Score
with Teacher Mean Domain Score

Domain I		Domain II		Domain III		Domain IV	
Indicator	r	Indicator	r	Indicator	r	Indicator	r
1a	.67	3a	.71	6a	.62	9a	.58
1b	.71	3b	.67	6b	.63	9b	.52
1c	.73	3c	.66	6c	.63	9c	.68
1d	.57	3d	.49	6d	.65	9d	.54
1e	.55	3e	.62	6e	.62	10a	.15
1f	.56	4a	.26	6f	.62	10b	.66
2a	.61	4b	.22	6g	.59	10c	.65
2b	.68	4c	.31	6h	.57	10d	.69
2c	.67	4d	.29	7a	.18	10e	.70
2d	.68	4e	.38	7b	.07		
2e	.60	5a	.37	7c	.63		
2f	.62	5b	.46	7d	.66		
		5c	.44	7e	.53		
		5d	.36	8a	.11		
		5e	.29	8b	.10		
		5f	.56	8c	.11		
		5g	.58	8d	.07		

Table 7

Factor Pattern Matrix for Analysis of TTAS Indicators

Indicator	Regression Coefficients	Indicator	Regression Coefficients
1a	.63	6a	.55
1b	.65	6b	.60
1c	.67	6c	.54
1d	.51	6d	.54
1e	.49	6e	.52
1f	.52	6f	.55
2a	.59	6g	.51
2b	.62	6h	.48
2c	.61	7a	.17
2d	.54	7b	.06
2e	.58	7c	.59
2f	.38	7d	.56
3a	.68	7e	.52
3b	.59	8a	.09
3c	.62	8b	.07
3d	.44	8c	.09
3e	.54	8d	.03
4a	.16	9a	.50
4b	.19	9b	.47
4c	.24	9c	.56
4d	.22	9d	.50
4e	.25	10a	.12
5a	.25	10b	.58
5b	.31	10c	.54
5c	.29	10d	.53
5d	.21	10e	.61
5e	.17		
5f	.50		
5g	.48		

Table 8

Decision Dependability with Two Observations

Decision Point Lower Category	Value of Φ					
	Domain I	Domain II	Domain III	Domain IV	Domain V	Composite Total
Unsatisfactory	.96	.99	.98	.94	.98	.98
Below Expectations	.90	.94	.95	.87	.96	.95
Satisfactory	.62	.53	.72	.56	.38	.73
Exceeds Expectations	.91	.87	.94	.73	.75	.91
Minimum Value Possible	.56	.42	.71	.49	.28	.70

Table 9

Decision Dependability with Four Observations

Decision Point Lower Category	Value of Ø					
	Domain I	Domain II	Domain III	Domain IV	Domain V	Obser Total
Unsatisfactory	.98	.99	.99	.97	.99	.99
Below Expectations	.95	.97	.98	.93	.98	.97
Satisfactory	.76	.70	.84	.72	.57	.81
Exceeds Expectations	.96	.93	.94	.84	.86	.94
Minimum Value Possible	.72	.59	.83	.66	.47	.78
Mean	14.00	17.73	18.36	10.42	16.24	
S.D.	2.47	1.66	2.19	1.85	.64	

Table 10

Generalizability Coefficients for TTAS Fall 1986 Assessment Data
with Number of Observation Days Varied,
A Single Observer and
Indicators Considered Fixed

Number of Days of Observation	Scores						
	Domain I	Domain II	Domain III	Domain IV	Domain V	Indicators 1-55	Indicators 1-71
1	.40	.27	.56	.33	.22	.54	.53
2	.58	.43	.72	.49	.36	.70	.70
3	.67	.53	.79	.59	.46	.78	.77
4	.73	.60	.84	.66	.53	.82	.82

Overview of the Texas Teacher Appraisal System

Part A. Classroom Teaching Performance Domains

These domains will be evaluated by both certified appraisers through formal classroom observation. If additional information related to the performance criteria has been documented and shared with the teacher, it may be included in the appraisal. Appraisers will be trained and certified through the state training program. The results will be used for staff development and for career ladder assignment, and may be used for contract renewal decisions.

Domains

I. Instructional Strategies

II. Classroom Management and Organization

III. Presentation of Subject Matter

IV. Learning Environment

Part B. Growth and Responsibilities Domain

This domain will be evaluated by both appraisers. Credit will be given for each indicator unless documentation on file supports withholding credit. Training will focus on due process procedures and documentation methods.

V. Growth and Responsibilities

Part C. Local Domains and Criteria

The local district may adopt additional domains and criteria; however, evaluation of these criteria will not directly impact career ladder decisions. The results will be used solely for contract renewal decisions and for staff development purposes. Training for these criteria will be the responsibility of the local district.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Texas Teacher Appraisal Instrument

Domain I. Instructional Strategies

Criterion 1. Provides opportunities for students to participate actively and successfully

Indicator
a. appropriately varies activities
b. interacts with students in group formats as appropriate
c. solicits student participation
d. extends students' responses/contributions
e. provides ample time for students to respond to teacher questions/ solicitations and to consider content as it is presented
f. implements instruction at an appropriate level of difficulty

Criterion 2. Evaluates and provides feedback on student progress during instruction

Indicator
a. communicates learning expectations
b. monitors student performances as they engage in learning activities
c. solicits responses or demonstrations from specific students for assessment purposes
d. reinforces correct responses
e. provides corrective feedback, or none needed
f. reteaches, or none needed

Domain II. Classroom Management and Organization

Criterion 3. Organizes materials and students

Indicator
a. secures student attention, or students are attending
b. uses administrative procedures and routines which facilitate instruction
c. gives clear administrative directions for classroom procedures or routines, or none needed
d. maintains seating arrangements/grouping appropriate for the activity and the environment
e. has materials, aids, and facilities ready for use

Criterion 4. Maximizes amount of time available for instruction

Indicator
a. begins promptly/avoids wasting time at the end of the instructional period
b. implements appropriate sequence of activities
c. maintains appropriate pace
d. maintains focus
e. keeps students engaged

Criterion 10. Maintains supportive environment

Indicator
a. avoids sarcasm and negative criticism
b. establishes climate of courtesy and respect
c. encourages slow and reluctant students
d. provides praise for specific performance
e. establishes and maintains positive rapport with students

Domain V. Growth and Responsibilities

Criterion 11. Plans for and engages in professional development

Indicator
a. shows progress in completing professional growth requirements as agreed upon with appraiser(s), or none needed
b. stays current in content taught
c. stays current in instructional methodology

Criterion 12. Interacts and communicates effectively with parents

Indicator
a. initiates communications with parents about student performance and/or behavior when appropriate
b. conducts parent-teacher conferences in accordance with local district policy
c. reports student progress to parents in accordance with local district policy
d. maintains confidentiality unless disclosure is required by law

Criterion 13. Complies with policies, operating procedures, and requirements

Indicator
a. follows statutory and Texas Education Agency regulations
b. follows district and campus policies and procedures
c. performs assigned professional duties
d. follows district promotion/retention policy and procedures

Criterion 14. Promotes and evaluates student growth

Indicator
a. participates in campus goal-setting for student progress
b. plans instruction in accordance with district requirements
c. documents student progress
d. maintains accurate records
e. reports student progress at appropriate intervals

Attachment 3

Name: _____

___ OBSERVATION RECORD _____ Date

___ EVALUATION RECORD _____ Date

Teacher _____ # _____ School Year ____-____

Assignment/Grade _____ School _____

Appraisal 1 or 2 (Circle) Name of Appraiser _____ Teacher Supervisor or Other Appraiser (Circle One)

Observation Date _____ Beginning Time _____ Ending Time _____

Scheduled _____ Unscheduled _____ Subject Area(s) Observed _____

Directions: Circle the number(s) for each indicator. At least one column will be marked for each indicator. Column "A/BS" is used to note "Absent/Below Standard" behaviors and has a credit value of 0. Column "SE" represents the "Standard Expectation" for each indicator and has a credit value of 1. Column "EQ" represents "Exceptional Quality" for each indicator and has a credit value of 1. To give credit to Column "EQ," credit must be given in Column "SE." Exceptional Quality credit is not applicable to some indicators. For these, a hyphen has been placed in Column "EQ." Provide documentation when marking either Column "A/BS" or "EQ." The teacher supervisor will compute credits at the end of the appraisal period, and the second appraiser will compute credits within 7 days of the formal observation. Changes should be initialed by person filling out the form. Documentation should be included on any performance indicator marked "A/BS" or "EQ."

I. Instructional Strategies

		Columns A/BS	SE	EQ
1. Provides opportunities for students to participate actively and successfully.				
	a. varies activities	0	1	1
	b. interacts with students	0	1	1
	c. solicits participation	0	1	1
	d. extends	0	1	1
	e. provides time	0	1	1
	f. implements at appropriate level of difficulty	0	1	1
2. Evaluates and provides feedback on student progress during instruction.				
	a. communicates expectations	0	1	1
	b. monitors	0	1	1
	c. solicits responses for assessment	0	1	1
	d. reinforces	0	1	1
	e. provides corrective feedback	0	1	1
	f. reteaches	0	1	1

FOR EVALUATION RECORD DOMAIN CREDIT TOTAL (SE credits + EQ credits) [ ]

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

II. Classroom Management and Organization

		ABS	SE	EC
3. Organizes materials and students.	a. secures student attention	0	1	
	b. uses procedures/routines	0	1	
	c. gives administrative directions	0	1	
	d. uses seating/grouping	0	1	
	e. has materials/aids/facilities ready	0	1	
4. Maximizes amount of time available for instruction.	a. begins promptly	0	1	
	b. implements sequence of activities	0	1	
	c. maintains pace	0	1	
	d. maintains focus	0	1	
	e. keeps students engaged	0	1	
5. Manages student behavior.	a. specifies expectations	0	1	
	b. prevents off-task behavior	0	1	
	c. redirects off-task behavior	0	1	
	d. stops inappropriate behavior	0	1	
	e. stops disruptive behavior	0	1	
	f. applies rules	0	1	
	g. reinforces appropriate behavior	0	1	

FOR EVALUATION RECORD
DOMAIN CREDIT TOTAL
(SE credits + EC credits)

III. Presentation of Subject Matter

6. Teaches for cognitive, affective, and/or psychomotor learning and transfer.	a. begins with introduction	0	1	1
	b. uses content sequence	0	1	1
	c. relates prior/future learning	0	1	1
	d. defines/describes	0	1	1
	e. elaborates critical attributes	0	1	1
	f. stresses generalization/principle/rule	0	1	1
	g. transfers	0	1	1
	h. closes instruction	0	1	1

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

III. Presentation of Subject Matter *(continued)*

		ABS	SE	EQ
7. Presents information accurately and clearly.	a. makes no significant errors	0	1	-
	b. uses appropriate vocabulary	0	1	-
	c. explains clearly	0	1	1
	d. stresses points/dimensions	0	1	1
	e. clarifies misunderstanding	0	1	1
8. Uses acceptable communication skills.	a. uses correct grammar	0	1	-
	b. pronounces correctly/clearly	0	1	-
	c. uses accurate language	0	1	-
	d. demonstrates written skills	0	1	-

FOR EVALUATION RECORD
DOMAIN CREDIT TOTAL
(SE credits + EQ credits)

IV. Learning Environment

9. Uses strategies to motivate students for learning.	a. relates to interests	0	1	1
	b. emphasizes value/importance	0	1	1
	c. reinforces efforts	0	1	1
	d. challenges	0	1	1
10. Maintains supportive environment.	a. avoids sarcasm/negative criticism	0	1	-
	b. maintains courteous climate	0	1	1
	c. encourages	0	1	1
	d. praises	0	1	1
	e. establishes rapport	0	1	1

FOR EVALUATION RECORD
DOMAIN CREDIT TOTAL
(SE credits + EQ credits)

V. Growth and Responsibilities

			Columns A-ES	SE	EQ
11. Plans for and engages in professional development.	a.	grows professionally	0	1	
	b.	stays current-content	0	1	
	c.	stays current-methods	0	1	
12. Interacts and communicates with parents.	a.	initiates communications	0	1	
	b.	conducts conferences	0	1	
	c.	reports progress	0	1	
	d.	maintains confidentiality	0	1	
13. Complies with policies, operating procedures, and requirements.	a.	follows TEA requirements	0	1	
	b.	follows district/campus policies/ procedures	0	1	
	c.	performs assigned duties	0	1	
	d.	follows promotion procedures	0	1	
14. Promotes and evaluates student growth.	a.	participates in goal-setting	0	1	
	b.	plans instruction	0	1	
	c.	documents program	0	1	
	d.	maintains records	0	1	
	e.	reports progress	0	1	

FOR EVALUATION RECORD
DOMAIN CREDIT TOTAL
(SE credits + EQ credits)

Comments:

(The signature of the teacher indicates that he/she has reviewed and received a copy of this Evaluation Record.)

Teacher Signature/Date Received

Appraiser Signature/Date Completed

Date of Conference (if any)

Original Copy—Central Office
Copy #2—Teacher's Supervisor
Copy #3—Teacher

Attachment =

APPRAISAL RECORD

Teacher _____ # _____ School Year 19____ ____

Assignment/Grade _____ School _____

Domain Subtotal

Teacher's Supervisor: (names) _____

Instructions: (1) Transfer the DOMAIN CREDIT TOTALS from the Evaluation Records, (2) add the totals, and (3) multiply the result by .60 to obtain the Domain Subtotal.

Domain		Appraisal 1		Appraisal 2				Domain Subtotal
I.	Instructional Strategies	_____	+	_____	=	_____	x	.60 = _____
II.	Classroom Management and Organization	_____	+	_____	=	_____	x	.60 = _____
III.	Presentation of Subject Matter	_____	+	_____	=	_____	x	.60 = _____
IV.	Learning Environment	_____	+	_____	=	_____	x	.60 = _____
V.	Growth and Responsibilities	_____	+	_____	=	_____	x	.60 = _____

Other Appraiser: (names) _____

Instructions: (1) By domain, transfer the DOMAIN CREDIT TOTALS from the Evaluations Records, (2) add the totals, and (3) multiply by .40 to obtain the Domain Subtotal.

Domain		Appraisal 1		Appraisal 2				Domain Subtotal
I.	Instructional Strategies	_____	+	_____	=	_____	x	.40 = _____
II.	Classroom Management and Organization	_____	+	_____	=	_____	x	.40 = _____
III.	Presentation of Subject Matter	_____	+	_____	=	_____	x	.40 = _____
IV.	Learning Environment	_____	+	_____	=	_____	x	.40 = _____
V.	Growth and Responsibilities	_____	+	_____	=	_____	x	.40 = _____

Domain Scores:

(1) Compute the Domain Total by adding the domain subtotals of both appraisers.
(2) Consult the Score Conversion Chart to convert each Domain Total to a Domain Score.

		Teacher Supervisor Domain Subtotal		Second Appraiser Domain Subtotal		Domain Total	Domain Score
I.	Instructional Strategies	_____	+	_____	=	_____	_____
II.	Classroom Organization and Management	_____	+	_____	=	_____	_____
III.	Presentation of Subject Matter	_____	+	_____	=	_____	_____
IV.	Learning Environment	_____	+	_____	=	_____	_____
V.	Growth and Responsibilities	_____	+	_____	=	_____	_____

Overall Summary Performance Score:

(1) Enter the Domain Scores in the spaces provided below and compute the sum,
(2) Divide the total by 5,

Domain Scores for:

Domain I		Domain II		Domain III		Domain IV		Domain V			Average
_____	+	_____	+	_____	+	_____	+	_____	=	_____ ÷5 =	_____

(3) Record the Overall Summary Performance Score as an average of the domain scores except that the overall performance score can be no higher than:
(a) 1.9 if one or more of the domain scores are 1 to 1.9 inclusive,
(b) 2.9 if two or more of the domain scores are 2 to 2.9 and no score is 1 to 1.9,
(c) 3.9 if no more than one domain score is 2 to 2.5, and no score is 1 to 1.9.

Overall Summary Performance Score = [ ]

_____
Teacher's Supervisor Signature/Date Completed

Signature of other Appraiser(s) if present at conference
_____
_____
_____

(The signature of the teacher indicates that he/she has received a copy of the Appraisal Record and the results of the performance appraisals have been discussed in a conference.)

_____
Teacher Signature

_____
Date of Conference

TEACHER SELF-APPRAISAL

School District_____ Co.-Dist. No _____

Teacher _____ #_____ School Year 19___-19___

Assignment/Grade _____ School _____

This appraisal provides an opportunity for teacher assessment of the achievement of the teacher's own instructional goals.

Part I.

Complete this section of the self-appraisal by the end of the second six weeks of the school year. If class assignments change each semester, this section is to be completed again by the end of the fourth six weeks of the school year. **Use only the space provided for each response.**

1. Describe each of the classes which you are assigned to teach this year (semester). Include information about the abilities, learning styles, characteristics, and/or achievement levels of **groups** of students within each class.

2. Describe one or more of your instructional goals which supports the school district's goals for student progress. This goal statement should include observable and measurable performance objectives for the groups described in Part I.

3. What methods or measures will you use to determine whether you have achieved these goals and objectives?

Teacher's Signature/Completion of Part I	Date Completed
Teacher's Signature/Completion of Part I (Second semester as needed)	Date Completed
Teacher Supervisor's Signature/Receipt of Part I	Date of Receipt

Original Copy—Central Office
Copy #2—Teacher's Supervisor on receipt of Part I
Copy #3—Teacher

TEACHER SELF-APPRAISAL

School District_____ Co.-Dist. No _____

Teacher _____ #_____ School Year 19___-19___

Assignment/Grade _____ School _____

Part II.

Complete this section within the week prior to the summative conference. **Use only the space provided for each response.**

4. Read again your completed statement in Part I, 1. In what ways were your perceptions of your classes modified as the year (semester) progressed?

5. Read again your goal statement in Part I, 2. Review student performance trends based on the measures which you specified in Part I, 3. Which of the goals/objectives were you able to achieve/not achieve? Discuss.

6. What sources of information helped you to ascertain student abilities, learning styles, characteristics, and achievement levels, to develop an appropriate set of instructional goals and performance objectives, and to select appropriate instructional strategies? What additional sources were needed?

7. In what ways has the teacher appraisal process, including this self-appraisal, helped you to identify areas of strength and areas in which you need professional growth?

8. What areas related to the criteria in the domains on the appraisal instrument have you identified for continued professional growth? What strengths have you identified in areas related to the criteria in the domains on the appraisal instrument?

9. What inservice training, advanced academic training, higher education course work, and/or district assistance will help you to achieve this growth?

_____ _____

Teacher's Signature/Completion of Part II — Date Completed

_____ _____

Teacher Supervisor's Signature/Review of Part II — Date of Review

Original Copy—Central Office
Copy #2—Teacher's Supervisor on receipt of Part II
Copy #3—Teacher

Attachment

SCORE CONVERSION CHART AS ADOPTED
BY THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
IN JANUARY 1987

For each domain, locate the range of weighted credits which contains the domain total on the Appraisal Record. The domain score for that range of weighted credits is listed in the right-hand column labeled DOMAIN SCORE.

Summary Domain Total for					
DOMAIN I	DOMAIN II	DOMAIN III	DOMAIN IV	DOMAIN V	DOMAIN SCORE
CLEARLY OUTSTANDING					
23.40-24.00	23.60-24.00	27.40-28.00	16.60-17.00	19.70-20.00	5.4
22.80-23.39	23.20-23.59	26.80-27.39	16.20-16.59	19.40-19.69	5.3
22.20-22.79	22.80-23.19	26.20-26.79	15.80-16.19	19.10-19.39	5.2
21.60-22.19	22.40-22.79	25.60-26.19	15.40-15.79	18.80-19.09	5.1
21.00-21.59	22.00-22.39	25.00-25.59	15.00-15.39	18.50-18.79	5.0
20.40-20.99	21.60-21.99	24.40-24.99	14.60-14.99	18.20-18.49	4.9
19.80-20.39	21.20-21.59	23.80-24.39	14.20-14.59	17.90-18.19	4.8
19.20-19.79	20.80-21.19	23.20-23.79	13.80-14.19	17.60-17.89	4.7
18.60-19.19	20.40-20.79	22.60-23.19	13.40-13.79	17.30-17.59	4.6
18.00-18.59	20.00-20.39	22.00-22.59	13.00-13.39	17.00-17.29	4.5
EXCEEDING EXPECTATION					
17.50-17.99	19.70-19.99	21.60-21.99	12.70-12.99	16.90-16.99	4.4
17.00-17.49	19.40-19.69	21.20-21.59	12.40-12.69	16.80-16.89	4.3
16.50-16.99	19.10-19.39	20.80-21.19	12.10-12.39	16.70-16.79	4.2
16.00-16.49	18.80-19.09	20.40-20.79	11.80-12.09	16.60-16.69	4.1
15.50-15.99	18.50-18.79	20.00-20.39	11.50-11.79	16.50-16.59	4.0
15.00-15.49	18.20-18.49	19.60-19.99	11.20-11.49	16.40-16.49	3.9
14.50-14.99	17.90-18.19	19.20-19.59	10.90-11.19	16.30-16.39	3.8
14.00-14.49	17.60-17.89	18.80-19.19	10.60-10.89	16.20-16.29	3.7
13.50-13.99	17.30-17.59	18.40-18.79	10.30-10.59	16.10-16.19	3.6
13.00-13.49	17.00-17.29	18.00-18.39	10.00-10.29	16.00-16.09	3.5
SATISFACTORY					
12.70-12.99	16.70-16.99	17.60-17.99	9.70- 9.99	15.80-15.99	3.4
12.40-12.69	16.40-16.69	17.20-17.59	9.40- 9.69	15.60-15.79	3.3
12.10-12.39	16.10-16.39	16.80-17.19	9.10- 9.39	15.40-15.59	3.2
11.80-12.09	15.80-16.09	16.40-16.79	8.80- 9.09	15.20-15.39	3.1
11.50-11.79	15.50-15.79	16.00-16.39	8.50- 8.79	15.00-15.19	3.0
11.20-11.49	15.20-15.49	15.60-15.99	8.20- 8.49	14.80-14.99	2.9
10.90-11.19	14.90-15.19	15.20-15.59	7.90- 8.19	14.60-14.79	2.8
10.60-10.89	14.60-14.89	14.80-15.19	7.60- 7.89	14.40-14.59	2.7
10.30-10.59	14.30-14.59	14.40-14.79	7.30- 7.59	14.20-14.39	2.6
10.00-10.29	14.00-14.29	14.00-14.39	7.00- 7.29	14.00-14.19	2.5

Summary Domain Total for

DOMAIN I	DOMAIN II	DOMAIN III	DOMAIN IV	DOMAIN V	DOMAIN SCORE
		BELOW EXPECTATION			
9.70- 9.99	13.60-13.99	13.70-13.99	6.80- 6.99	13.90-13.99	2.4
9.40- 9.69	13.20-13.59	13.40-13.69	6.60- 6.79	13.80-13.89	2.3
9.10- 9.39	12.80-13.19	13.10-13.39	6.40- 6.59	13.70-13.79	2.2
8.80- 9.09	12.40-12.79	12.80-13.09	6.20- 6.39	13.60-13.69	2.1
8.50- 8.79	12.00-12.39	12.50-12.79	6.00- 6.19	13.50-13.59	2.0
8.20- 8.49	11.60-11.99	12.20-12.49	5.80- 5.99	13.40-13.49	1.9
7.90- 8.19	11.20-11.59	11.90-12.19	5.60- 5.79	13.30-13.39	1.8
7.60- 7.89	10.80-11.19	11.60-11.89	5.40- 5.59	13.20-13.29	1.7
7.30- 7.59	10.40-10.79	11.30-11.59	5.20- 5.39	13.10-13.19	1.6
7.00- 7.29	10.00-10.39	11.00-11.29	5.00- 5.19	13.00-13.09	1.5
		UNSATISFACTORY			
6.53- 6.99	9.33- 9.99	10.26-10.99	4.66- 4.99	12.13-12.99	1.4
6.06- 6.52	8.66- 9.32	9.53-10.25	4.33- 4.65	11.26-12.12	1.3
5.59- 6.05	7.99- 8.65	8.80- 9.52	4.00- 4.32	10.39-11.25	1.2
5.13- 5.58	7.33- 7.98	8.06- 8.79	3.66- 3.99	9.53-10.38	1.1
4.66- 5.12	6.66- 7.32	7.33- 8.05	3.33- 3.65	8.66- 9.52	1.0
4.19- 4.65	5.99- 6.65	6.60- 7.32	3.00- 3.32	7.79- 8.65	0.9
3.73- 4.18	5.33- 5.98	5.86- 6.59	2.66- 2.99	6.93- 7.78	0.8
3.26- 3.72	4.66- 5.32	5.13- 5.85	2.33- 2.65	6.06- 6.92	0.7
2.79- 3.25	3.99- 4.65	4.40- 5.12	2.00- 2.32	5.19- 6.05	0.6
2.33- 2.78	3.33- 3.98	3.66- 4.39	1.66- 1.99	4.33- 5.18	0.5
1.86- 2.32	2.66- 3.32	2.93- 3.65	1.33- 1.65	3.46- 4.32	0.4
1.39- 1.85	1.99- 2.65	2.20- 2.92	1.00- 1.32	2.59- 3.45	0.3
0.93- 1.38	1.33- 1.98	1.46- 2.19	0.66- 0.99	1.73- 2.58	0.2
0.46- 0.92	0.66- 1.32	0.73- 1.45	0.33- 0.65	0.86- 1.72	0.1
0.00- 0.45	0.00- 0.65	0.00- 0.72	0.00- 0.32	0.00- 0.85	0.0

The Overall Summary Performance Score is an average of the domain scores except that the overall performance score can be no higher than:

a) 1.4 if one or more of the domain scores are 0.0 to 1.4 inclusive, or
b) 2.4 if two or more of the domain scores are 1.5 to 2.4 and no score is 0.0 to 1.4.

The Overall Summary Performance Score is interpreted as:

a) unsatisfactory if the score is 0.0 to 1.4;
b) below expectation if the score is 1.5 to 2.4;
c) satisfactory if the score is 2.5 to 3.4;
d) exceeding expectation if the score is 3.5 to 4.4; or
e) clearly outstanding if the score is 4.5 to 5.4

Conferences: If the teacher's credit total for a formal observation is less than Satisfactory by this chart, the teacher is entitled to a conference with the appraiser who conducted the observation.

Professional Growth Plan: If the teacher's final domain score for the year for any domain is less than exceeding expectation by this chart, a Professional Growth Plan will be developed.